UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,270	07/19/2001	Thomas E. Creamer	BOC9-2000-0058 (193)	2916

40987 7590 06/12/2006

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, TOAN D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/910,270	CREAMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Toan D. Nguyen	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 September 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/29/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 21 and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1 line 11, t is suggested to change "a voice communication link" to --- said voice communication link ---. Similar problems exist in claim 5 line 6, claim 10 line 10, claim 13 line 5, claim 21 line 11, and claim 31 line 4 and line 6.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-17 and 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gifford et al. (US 6,549,612) in view of Shenefiel (US 6,857,008).

For claim 1, Gifford et al. disclose unified communication services via e-mail, comprising:

inserting a voice communications in an e-mail message (col. 6 lines 30-33 and col. 7 lines 28-30) sent from a sender at a sending node (caller means, figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 19-20) to a recipient at a receiving node (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means) (figure 5, reference steps 580, 590 and 595, col. 15 lines 18-26);

embedding within said voice communications an executable voice communications link program component (col. 6 lines 30-33 and col. 7 lines 28-30), said program component configured to execute within said receiving node (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means) (col. 6 lines 35-37 and col. 8 lines 65-67) to establish a voice communication link between said sending node and said receiving node (col. 9 lines 2-7);

transmitting said e-mail message to said recipient (figure 5, reference steps 580, 590 and 595, col. 15 lines 18-26); and

responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communication (figure 6, col. 8 lines 55-58 and col. 15 lines 56-58), establishing a voice communications link between said sender and said recipient (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means) (col. 10 lines 7-34).

However, Gifford et al. do not expressly disclose a voice communications identifier. In an analogous art, Shenefiel discloses a voice communications identifier (col. 7 lines 48-50).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the voice communication identifier, and would have applied Shenefiel's XML tag in Gifford et al.'s e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Shenefiel's arrangement for accessing an IP-based messaging server by telephone for management of stored messages in Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail with the motivation being to perform an IMAP operation based on supplied user speech information (col. 7 lines 50-51).

For claim 2, Gifford et al. disclose wherein said inserting step further comprises the step of inserting in said e-mail message a selectable symbol denoting voice communication availability (col. 6 lines 15-37).

For claim 3, Gifford et al. disclose wherein said inserting step further comprises the step of inserting in said e-mail message a reference to said sender of said e-mail message (figure 2, col. 4 lines 35-40 and col. 5 lines 25-37).

For claim 4, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communications identifier, executing said executable voice communications link program component in order to establish said voice communications link with said sender (col. 7 lines 28-30 and col. 8 lines 65-67).

For claim 5, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of responsive to said recipient (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means) selecting said voice communications identifier (col. 7 lines 28-30 and col. 8 lines 65-67), determining a link address for said sender based on said reference, and executing said executable voice communications link program component at said receiving node in order to establish a voice communications link with said sender according to said determined line address (figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 38).

For claim 6, Gifford et al disclose wherein said link address is a telephone number (col. 14 lines 38).

For claim 8, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communications identifier (col. 7 lines 28-30 and col. 8 lines 65-67), establishing a Voice over IP (VoIP) based voice communications link with said recipient (col. 11 lines 3-4).

For claim 9, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communications identifier (col. 8 lines 65-67), establishing a telephony-based voice communications link with said recipient over a public switched telephone network (PSTN) (col. 11 lines 1-4).

For claim 10, Gifford et al disclose unified communication services via e-mail, comprising:

detecting a voice communications inserted in an e-mail message (col. 6 lines 30-33 and col. 7 lines 28-30) transmitted by a sender at a sending node (caller means, figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 19-20) to a recipient at a receiving node

(figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means)(figure 5, reference steps 580, 590 and 595, col. 15 lines 18-26), said voice communications having embedded therein an executable voice communications link program component (col. 6 lines 30-33 and col. 7 lines 28-30) configured to execute within said receiving node (col. 8 lines 65-67) to establish a voice communications link between said sending node and said receiving node (col. 9 lines 2-7);

responsive to detecting said voice communications (figure 5, reference 510, col. 14 lines 47-50), displaying a selectable icon (figure 4, col. 8 lines 16-19 and col. 8 lines 55-58); and

responsive to a selection of said icon (figure 6, col. 8 lines 55-58 and col. 15 lines 56-58), establishing a voice communications link between said sender and said recipient (col. 10 lines 7-34).

However, Gifford et al. do not expressly disclose a voice communications identifier. In an analogous art, Shenefiel discloses a voice communications identifier (col. 7 lines 48-50).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the voice communications identifier, and would have applied Shenefiel's XML tag in Gifford et al.'s e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Shenefiel's arrangement for accessing an IP-based messaging server by telephone for management of stored messages in Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail with the motivation being to perform an IMAP operation based on supplied user speech information (col. 7 lines 50-51).

For claim 11, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of extracting said executable voice communications link program component from said voice communications identifier to establish said voice communications link with said sender (col. 6 lines 53-61 and col. 14 lines 44-50); and

responsive to said selection of said icon, executing said executable voice communications link program component (col. 6 lines 47-61).

For claim 12, Gifford et al disclose the step of extracting an embedded reference to said sender from said e-mail message (col. 6 lines 53-61 and col. 14 lines 44-50).

For claim 13, Gifford et al disclose wherein said executing step further comprises the step of:

determining a link address for said sender based on said extracted reference (figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 38), and

executing said executable voice communications link program component in order to establish a voice communications link with said sender according to said determined line address (col. 6 lines 56-61).

For claim 14, Cloutier discloses wherein said link address is a telephone number (col. 14 lines 38).

For claim 16, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communications identifier, establishing a Voice over LP (VoIP) based voice communications link with said recipient (col. 11 lines 3-4).

For claim 17, Gifford et al disclose wherein said establishing step comprises the step of responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communications identifier, establishing a telephony-based voice communications link with said recipient over a public switched telephone network (PSTN) (col. 11 lines 1-4).

For claim 21, Gifford et al. disclose unified communication services via e-mail, comprising:

inserting a voice communication in an e-mail message (col. 6 lines 30-37 and col. 7 lines 28-30) from a sender (caller means, figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 19-20) to a recipient node (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means) (figure 5, reference steps 580, 590 and 595, col. 15 lines 18-26), said voice communications having embedded therein an executable voice communications link program component (col. 6 lines 30-33 and col. 7 lines 28-30) configured to execute within said receiving node (col. 8 lines 65-67) to establish a voice communications link between said sending node and said receiving node (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means)(col. 9 lines 2-7);

transmitting said e-mail message to said recipient (figure 5, reference steps 580, 590 and 595, col. 15 lines 18-26); and

responsive to said recipient selecting said voice communication (figure 6, col. 8 lines 55-58 and col. 15 lines 56-58), establishing a voice communications link between said sender and said recipient (col. 10 lines 7-34).

However, Gifford et al. do not expressly disclose a voice communication identifier. In an analogous art, Shenefiel discloses a voice communication identifier (col. 7 lines 48-50).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the voice communication identifier, and would have applied Shenefiel's XML tag in Gifford et al.'s e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Shenefiel's arrangement for accessing an IP-based messaging server by telephone for management of stored messages in Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail with the motivation being to perform an IMAP operation based on supplied user speech information (col. 7 lines 50-51).

For claim 22, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 2. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 23, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 3. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 24, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 4. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 25, the claim is directed to the carne subject matter in claim 5. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claims 26 and 34, the claims are directed to the same subject matter in claim 6. Therefore, they are subjected to the same rejection.

For claims 27 and 35, the claims are directed to the same subject matter in claim 7. Therefore, they are subjected to the same rejection.

For claims 28 and 36, the claims are directed to the same subject matter in claim 8. Therefore, they are subjected to the same rejection.

For claims 29 and 37, the claims are directed to the same subject matter in claim 9. Therefore, they are subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 30, Gifford et al disclose unified communication services via e-mail, comprising:

detecting a voice communications inserted in an e-mail message (col. 6 lines 30-37 and col. 7 lines 28-30) transmitted by a sender at a sending node (caller means, figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 19-20) to a recipient at a receiving node (figure 2, user interface means or subscriber means) (figure 5, reference steps 580, 590 and 595, col. 15 lines 18-26);

responsive to detecting said voice communications (figure 5, reference 510, col. 14 lines 47-50), displaying a selectable icon (figure 4, col. 8 lines 16-19 and col. 8 lines 55-58); and

responsive to a selection of said icon (figure 6, col. 8 lines 55-58 and col. 15 lines 56-58), extracting a voice communications link program component with said voice communications (col. 8 lines 65-67) and establishing a voice communications link between said sender and said recipient (col. 9 lines 2-7 and col. 10 lines 7-34).

However, Gifford et al. do not expressly disclose a voice communications identifier. In an analogous art, Shenefiel discloses a voice communications identifier (col. 7 lines 48-50).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the voice communications identifier, and would have applied Shenefiel's XML tag in Gifford et al.'s e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Shenefiel's arrangement for accessing an IP-based messaging server by telephone for management of stored messages in Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail with the motivation being to perform an IMAP operation based on supplied user speech information (col. 7 lines 50-51).

For claim 31, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 11. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 32, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 12. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 33, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 13. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

5. Claims 7, 15, 18-20 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gifford et al. (US 6,549,612) in view of Shenefiel (US 6,857,008) and further in view of Funk et al (US 5,937,162).

For claims 7, 15 and 18, Gifford et al disclose extracting embedded references to said sender, said embedded references being extracted from said e-mail message and displaying a corresponding selectable icon (col. 8 lines 49-67 and col. 14 lines 47-50 as set fort in claim 18).

However, Gifford et al in view of Shenefiel do not expressly disclose at least one other recipient of said e-mail message and displaying for each of said at least one other

recipient. In an analogous art, Funk et al disclose at least one other recipient of said e-mail message and displaying for each of said at least one other recipient (figure 1, reference 114, col. 5 lines 66-67 as set forth in claim 18).

Funk et al disclose wherein said link address is an IP address (as set forth in claims 7 and 15).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the at least one other recipient of said e-mail message and displaying for each of said at least one other recipient, and would have applied Funk et al.'s service processing system in Gifford et al.'s e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Funk et al.'s method and apparatus for high volume e-mail delivery in Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail with the motivation being to feed those e-mail messages through the internet 106 to end user terminals 114 (col. 5 lines 66-67).

For claim 19, Gifford et al. disclose wherein said executing step further comprises the step of:

responsive to a selection of one of said selectable icons, identifying a corresponding recipient (col. 6 lines 15-65 and col. 7 lines 28-30), determining a link address for said corresponding recipient based on said extracted reference, and

executing said executable voice communications link program component in order to establish said voice communications link with said sender according to said determined line address (figure 5, reference step 500, col. 8 lines 65-67 and col. 14 lines 38).

For claim 20, Gifford et al. disclose wherein said executing step further comprises the step of:

responsive to a selection of two or more of said selectable icons, identifying a corresponding recipient (col. 6 lines 15-65 and col. 7 lines 28-30), determining a link address for said corresponding recipient based on said extracted reference (figure 5, reference step 500, col. 14 lines 38), and

executing said executable voice communications link program component in order to establish a voice communications link with said sender according to said determined line address (figure 5, reference step 500, col. 8 lines 65-67 and col. 14 lines 38).

For claim 38, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 18. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 39, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 19. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

For claim 40, the claim is directed to the same subject matter in claim 20. Therefore, it is subjected to the same rejection.

6. Claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino, II (US 5,680,551) in view of Gifford et al. (US 6,549,612).

For claims 41-43, Martino, II discloses electronic messaging method of and system for heterogeneous connectivity and universal and generic interfacing for distributed applications and processes residing in wide variety of computing platforms and communication transport facilities, comprising:

a message header component encapsulating a reference to at least one of a sending node (figure 5, reference SENDING COMPUTER) in the network and a recipient node (figure 5, reference RECEIVING COMPUTER) in the network (col. 10 lines 28-29);

a text message component encapsulating message text (col. 1 lines 30-36).

However, Martino, II does not disclose message text which can be extracted from the electronic message and displayed in a message client; and an executable voice communications link program component configured to established a voice communications link between said sending and recipient nodes by executing within said recipient node. In an analogous art, Gifford et al. disclose message text which can be extracted from the electronic message and displayed in a message client (col. 6 lines 47-53 and col. 14 lines 47-50); and an executable voice communications link program component configured to established a voice communications link between said sending and recipient nodes by executing within said recipient node (col. 6 lines 53-61 and col. 8 lines 65-67).

Gifford et al. disclose further wherein said voice communications link is a Voice over IP (VoIP) based communication link (col. 11 lines 1-4 as set forth in claim 42), wherein said voice communications link is a telephony-based link (col. 11 lines 1-4 as set forth in claim 43).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the message text which can be extracted from the electronic message and displayed in a message client, and would have applied Gifford et al.'s e-mail message in Martino, II.'s encapsulation. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail in Martino, II's electronic messaging method of and system for heterogeneous connectivity and universal and generic interfacing for distributed applications and processes residing in wide variety of computing platforms and communication transport facilities with the motivation being to provide the extended functionality and power gained in sending an enriched e-mail message (including a user interface) as compared to a conventional text only e-mail messages (col. 5 lines 54-57).

7. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gifford et al. (US 6,549,612) in view of Shenefiel (US 6,857,008) and Martino, II (US 5,680,551) further in view of Funk et al (US 5,937,162).

For claim 44, Gifford et al disclose unified communication services via e-mail, comprising:

a conventional e-mail processor (figure 1, col. 3 lines 54-55), said conventional e-mail processor extracting and displaying message text in an e-mail conveyed by a sender to a recipient in a data communication network (col. 6 lines 47-53 and col. 15 lines 18-26); and

a processor (figure 1, col. 3 lines 54-55), said processor identifying a voice communication link in said received e-mail (col. 6 lines 53-61), displaying a selectable icon in response to detecting said voice communication link identifier (col. 6 lines 53-66) and, responsive to a selection of said selectable icon, establishing a voice communications link between said recipient and said sender of said received e-mail by

executing an executable voice communications link program component embedded in said link identifier (col. 6 lines 55-67 and col. 9 lines 2-7).

Gifford et al. do not expressly disclose a voice communications identifier. In an analogous art, Shenefiel discloses a voice communications identifier (col. 7 lines 48-50).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the voice communications identifier, and would have applied Shenefiel's XML tag in Gifford et al.'s e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Shenefiel's arrangement for accessing an IP-based messaging server by telephone for management of stored messages in Gifford et al.'s unified communication services via e-mail with the motivation being to perform an IMAP operation based on supplied user speech information (col. 7 lines 50-51).

However, Gifford et al. in view of Shenefiel do not expressly disclose message text encapsulated in a received e-mail. In an analogous art, Martino, II discloses message text encapsulated in a received e-mail (col. 1 lines 31-33).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the message text encapsulated in a received email to use the teachings of Martino, II in the system of Gifford et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the message text encapsulated in a received e-mail as taught by Martino, II in Gifford et al's system with the motivation being to produce at each final destination (col. 1 lines 33-36).

Moreover, Gifford et al in view of Shenefiel and Martino, II does not expressly disclose a voice conversation processor. In an analogous art, Funk et al disclose a voice conversation processor (figure 2, reference 218, col. 6 line 34).

One skilled in the art would have recognized a voice conversation processor to use the teachings of Funk et al. in the system of Gifford et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the voice conversation processor as taught by Funk et al in Gifford et al's system with the motivation being included in service processing system (col. 6 line 32).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 03/28/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues with respect to claims 1, 10, 21 and 30, that neither Gifford nor Shenefiel teach or suggest embedding an executable voice communications link program component in a voice communications identifier conveyed via an e-mail message sent from a sender at a sending node to a recipient at a receiving node, as recited in an amended independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 30. The examiner disagrees. Applicant's attention is directed to Gifford patent at col. 6 lines 25-27 (see Figure. 2) where Gifford clearly teaches "Accordingly, when a UC server (sender at a sending node means) sends an e-mail to a subscriber (a recipient at a receiving node means), the e-mail contains interaction controls (e.g., buttons or Universal Resource Links (URLs))". Gifford teaches further at col. 6 lines 30-33 "The interaction controls are sent

with the e-mail as part of an HTML, WML or XML document which is attached to the e-mail (e.g., a MIME attachment) in the form of a graphical user interface."

Moreover, the applicant argues that neither Gifford nor Shenefiel teach or suggest an executable voice communications link program component that is configured to execute within the receiving node in order to establish a voice communications link between the sending and receiving nodes, as further recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 30. The examiner disagrees. Applicant's attention is directed to Gifford patent at col. 6 lines 35-37, where Gifford clearly teach "On the other hand, a message can be attached to the e-mail so that it is downloaded with the HTML or WML document to the subscriber's computer" (an executable voice communications link program component that is configured to execute within the receiving node means). Gifford further teach at col. 8 lines 65-67 "In .wav format, the entire message is downloaded from the Web Server to the interface (subscriber's computer means) before the message starts playing. (when the user selects the "Listen/View" link for a voice message (col. 8 lines 55-56)) and at col. 9 lines 2-7, Gifford teach "In audio streaming format, the message is played as it downloads from the Web Server to the interface. A streaming player such as the Call Sciences GSM Audio Streaming Player or the RealNetworks RealAudio Player can be used to listen to voice messages in streaming audio format." (an executable voice communications link program component that is configured to execute within the receiving node in order to establish a voice communications link between the sending and receiving nodes menas). Therefore, Gifford does teach "embedding an executable voice

communications link program component in a voice communications identifier conveyed via an e-mail message sent from a sender at a sending node to a recipient at a receiving node" as recited in the amended independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 30.

With respect to independent claims 41 and 43, the same response as recited in claims 1, 10, 21 and 30. The applicant's argue with respect to claim 41, that Gifford fails to teach or suggest a voice communications link program component that is embedded in a identifier and that can be executed in a receiving node or a client to establish a voice communications link. The examiner disagrees. Applicant's attention is direct to the same argument in claims 1, 10, 21, and 30. Therefore, Gifford does teach the limitations feature as recited in amended independent 1, 10, 21, 30, 41 and 44.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3153. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00AM-4:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN
TN

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600